Comments: (5-28-19, Internal)
1. This test now requires the contractor to conduct the testing. I am not sure as to why they want the contractor to complete this testing versus FDOT. Another question is how many workers have this experience?

Response:

2. I’m inexperienced with applying methacrylate, so I can’t say that I know how this process has worked in the past, but my initial read has me confused about responsibilities.

Response:

3. In 413-3.4.6, Sand Distribution, are they putting responsibility for a friction test onto the contractor? I’ve never done one of these and can’t imagine many have. I certainly can’t “provide workers experienced in friction testing”.

Response:

4. I’m confused as to who is conducting the friction test and who provides the equipment. Who provides the trailer type measuring vehicle for the friction test? I went back and read the existing unaltered specification and it really didn’t help me figure out then intent.

Response:

5. I think it’s going to be real tough to get someone to perform the friction tests. Due to the specialty nature I think it should stay with the Department.

Response:

6. Is the spec as written for all sealing operations? If so, sealing a small area to due to cracking during construction should not have the same friction requirement/testing as that of a large deck area being treated as part of rehabilitation.

Response:

7. It appears that the spec covers ALL sealing – not just complete deck rehab projects. Every small bridge we have completed with FIB girders and no intermediate webs or thickened ends has seen minor structural cracking (due to design) on each side of the bents once traffic is on it for a few days. The accepted repair method has been isolated surface sealing with methacrylate and hand-broadcasted sand. Width of sealing area perpendicular to wheelpaths is only a couple inches. This should not be included with entire span type rehabilitation.
Response:

8. I agree and it never has been tested before so we need to get this clarified now and removed so no CEI misconstrues the meaning of this specification.

Response:

9. Same as the sealing, there should be some difference between rehabilitation of a complete structure and minor replacement/addition of bracing members, etc.

Response:

******************************************************************************
Karen Byram
414-4353
karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us
******************************************************************************

Comments: (6-17-19)
This specification change affect APL products by the change in the test method. Additionally, there is no reference to a test method for Odor, Bulk cure Speed, Surface Cure, Gel time, Tack Free time and Wax content.

Response:

******************************************************************************
Deborah Ihsan
954-777-4387
deborah.ihsan@dot.state.fl.us
******************************************************************************

Comments: (7-3-19)
The monomer shall have a shelf life of no less than 12 months and shall be no more than 8 months old at the time of application. Reason: The contents seems to be contradictory.